

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 24, 2004 has been received and carefully noted. The amendments made herein and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

A "Petition for Extension of Time" for extending the due date for responding to the Office Action by two months and a credit card payment form to cover the fee payment (\$420.00) for the extension are filed with this Amendment. Authorization is granted to charge counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Docket No. 024016-00063, for any additional fees necessary for entry of this Amendment.

The Abstract has been amended. Claims 1, 14, 17, 20 and 21 have been amended and claims 13 and 22 have been cancelled. Applicant submits that the amendments made herein are fully supported in the Specification and the drawings, as originally filed, and therefore no new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, claims 1-12 and 14-21 are pending in the present application and are respectfully submitted for reconsideration.

The Abstract of the invention stands objected to for informalities. The Abstract has been amended accordingly in response to the Examiner's objection and it is submitted that the Abstract, as amended, complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.72(b). Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 2, 3 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Specifically, with respect to claim 2, it is submitted that support for control of the frequency of the output clock signal as recited in the claim is found in the Specification at page 16, line 18 – page 17, line 11. Accordingly based on this support in the Specification, it is

submitted that the claim is not misdescriptive as suggested by the Examiner. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of claim 3, it is noted that in reviewing the Examiner's comments, it is believed that the Examiner is referring to claim 4 rather than claim 3. Therefore, it is believed that the Examiner intended to reject claim 4, and not claim 3, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the arguments herein rely on the same. With respect to claim 4, it is submitted that support for control of the frequency of the output clock signal is found in the Specification at page 17, line 13 – page 19, line 5. Accordingly based on this support in the Specification, it is submitted that the claim is not misdescriptive as suggested by the Examiner. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 20, it has been amended to delete the word “analog” from “control voltage generation circuit.” However, with respect to the claim language “analog difference voltage”, support for this claim language is found in the Specification at page 40, line 19 – page 41, line 6. Accordingly based on this support in the Specification, it is submitted that the claim is not misdescriptive as suggested by the Examiner. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The undersigned counsel further submits that if a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the above, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned counsel at the Examiner's convenience.

Claims 1-12, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Kokubo et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,982,208). Claims 2-12 and 20 are dependent on independent claim 1. The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 13-19 and 22, objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten to

overcome minor objections and if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the content of dependent claim 13 and claim 13 has accordingly been canceled. In addition, dependent claims 14 and 17 have been amended accordingly to depend from claim 1. Furthermore, independent claim 21 has been amended to include the content of dependent claim 22 and claim 22 has accordingly been canceled. It is therefore submitted that claims 1-12 and 14-21 are therefore patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicant's undersigned counsel at the telephone number, indicated below, to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

Dated: August 24, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Marylee Jenkins
Registration No. 37,645
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX, PLLC
1675 Broadway
New York, New York 10019
Tel: (212) 484-3928
Fax: (212) 484-3990

MLJ/my